

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

MARGARET V. BELT, on behalf of	)	4:06CV3130
herself and all others similarly situated,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
	)	<b>AND ORDER</b>
CHADRON HOUSING AUTHORITY,	)	
a Nebraska municipal corporation;	)	
SHAILA MURDOCK, individually and	)	
in her official capacity as Chief	)	
Executive of the Chadron Housing	)	
Authority; and CINDY BRODERICK,	)	
in her official capacity as Chief	)	
Executive of the CHA,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

The plaintiff has filed a motion for the entry of a consent decree (filing 17).<sup>1</sup> The proposed consent decree attached to the motion is electronically signed by the defendants' attorney under the word "approved," but the court must be absolutely certain that the defendants have no objection to the motion before it may be granted.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly,

---

<sup>1</sup> The filing is erroneously docketed as a "joint motion."

<sup>2</sup> I note that this is not a class action. Thus, a question may arise as to whether the plaintiff will have standing to enforce the consent decree should the decree be violated by an action that does not impair the rights or interests of the plaintiff. That said, it is premature to address that issue as it may never arise.

IT IS ORDERED that within ten (10) days the defendants shall respond to the plaintiff's motion (filing 17) by filing a statement that indicates whether or not they have any objection to the court granting the motion.

October 16, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Richard G. Kopf*  
United States District Judge